DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 128 973 SP 008 752

AUTHOR Paulston, Rolland G.
TITLE Social and Educational Change: Conceptual Frameworks.
INSTITUTION Pittsburgh Univ., Pa. International and Development Education Program.
PUB DATE Oct 75
NOTE 41p.; Not available in hard copy due to marginal reproducibility of original document

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Bibliographies; Conflict; *Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; *Literature Reviews; Models; *Social Change; Systems Approach; Theories

ABSTRACT

This review seeks to delineate the total range of theoretical perspectives that have been used to support educational reform strategies and to suggest how individual choice behavior follows from basic philosophical, ideological, and experimental orientations to perceived social reality. Part 1 is an introduction. Part 2 typologizes and synthesizes existing conceptual work on social and educational change to produce insights useful in the immediate task of delineating assumptions underlying reform proposals in any given system. Eight conceptual frameworks are examined--evolutionary, neo-evolutionary, structural-functionist, systems, Marxian, neo-Marxian, cultural revitalization, and anarchistic-utopian. Part 3 concludes the review with an assessment of existing theoretical windows on reality and their power to explain and predict educational change phenomena. The materials chosen for review are of two general types. They include works on social change that also address implications for educational change and studies of educational change that are framed in various social change perspectives.
(Author/IRT)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED128973

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SOCIAL AND EDUCATIONAL CHANGE: CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORKS

Rolland G. Paulston

International and Development Education Program
Division of Educational Studies
School of Education
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15260

October 1976

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CS 752

PART I

INTRODUCTION

Attempts to alter educational systems continually recur in both developing and advanced industrial societies. Such induced educational-change efforts range broadly, from innovations in classroom activities to large-scale reforms seeking system-wide change in educational goals, priorities, and structures. Work on innovations in schools is fairly well advanced and will not be treated here. The interested reader is directed to the comprehensive review by Pincus (1974).

Instead, my concern will be to review major theoretical perspectives on educational change-cum-reform at the national level. I will seek to relate notions of causality in educational change to several theories of social change. More specifically, I shall attempt to answer the questions: What can a review of the international literature tell us about the relationships between social-change theories and assumptions concerning the feasibility, processes, and outcomes for educational change? How might such a review and categorization then be used to illustrate how conflicting theories of social and educational change lead to quite different assessments of educational-reform potentials and evaluations of outcomes?[1]

Despite obvious conceptual difficulties in the study of large-scale reform phenomena, the need to develop more rigorous theoretical perspectives on the origins and effects of educational reforms remains. Although educational planners, policy makers, administrators, and the like, who constantly make assumptions about reforms, may be most concerned with political and technical considerations, there is, I contend, a need to understand better how personal theoretical bias influences individual views of social reality and educational-reform strategies and tactics.

Additional goals are, accordingly, to stimulate greater awareness both of how views of social reality and social change tend to channel and filter individual perceptions and to indicate some alternative possibilities for looking at educational-change potentials and constraints.

FOOTNOTE

[1]This paper draws heavily on two studies that I recently completed for the World Bank project on Educational Reform and Economic Development (RPO319) coordinated by John Simmons. The first, "Conflicting Theories of Social and Educational Change" (86 p.), is available as a University of Pittsburgh Center for International Studies Occasional Paper. The secord is "Evaluating Educational Change: An International Casebook" (460 p.).

In sum, this review seeks to delineate the total range of theoretical perspectives that have been used to support educational-reform strategies and to suggest how individual choice behavior follows from basic philosophical, ideological, and experimental orientations to perceived social reality (Pribram, 1949; Berger, 1970; Blackburn, 1972).

The organization is in three parts. Following the Introduction in Part I, I typologize and synthesize existing conceptual work on social and educational change in Part II to produce insights useful in the immediate task of delineating assumptions underlying reform proposals in any given system. These assumptions are summarized in Figure 1. Part III concludes the review with an assessment of existing theoretical windows on reality (see Figure One) and their "power" to explain and predict educational-change phenomena. A note on research and priorities needed if we are to move toward greater understanding and more fruitful study of the conditions influencing structural-change efforts in educational systems is also included.

Materials chosen for review are of two general types. They include works on social change that also address implications for educational change as well as studies of educational change that are framed--either implicitly or explicitly--in various social-change perspectives. The six theoretical orientations chosen represent a compromise of sorts based on possibilities for alternative categorizations and conceptual orientations found in the literature, as well as previous efforts to categorize social and educational-change strategies. It should be noted that the basic criterion for item selection is the presence of rationales for educational change, i.e., proposals where the normative and theoretical rationales may be identified and typed.

In presenting this highly selective review, it is well to acknowledge at the outset my predisposition to view ideology, power, and perceived group self-interest as key factors influencing planning and implementation of basic educational reforms. Although these three concepts have been repugnant to the liberal/conservative world view long predominant in U. S. reform and innovation efforts, there are indications that ideology at least may at long last become regarded as a respectable independent variable in U. S. reform studies (Swift,

1971: Popkewitz, 1975). Messick (1971), for example, recently argued in a conference on educational testing that:

> What is at issue is ideology. It is not the implications of research results per se that are to be implemented in the proposed strategies, it is the implications of research as interpreted or filtered through a particular ideology about the nature of man and society.

PART II

THEORIES AND MODELS OF SOCIAL AND EDUCATIONAL CHANGE

In the past several decades, a number of theories--i. e., bodies of logically interdependent generalized concepts with empirical referents--have been elaborated in efforts to specify under what conditions significant ideological, structural, and programmatic changes occur in educational systems. As we shall see, this work--albeit implicitly--draws heavily on more general theories of planned social change, and is in what might be charitably viewed as a nascent state of development (Land, 1975). As neither social scientists nor educators agree on basic "theories" of social and educational change, the choices presented here can only be viewed as arbitrary, yet defensible in terms of the need for comprehensiveness, mutual exclusiveness, the need for critical synthesis, and the state of the literature (Smith, 1973).

In any attempt to suggest relationships between shared values and research traditions, and diagnostic and prescriptive orientations, the concept of paradigm is helpful. Kuhn (1970) defines paradigms as the way a scientific/professional community views a field of study, identifies appropriate problems for study, and specifies legitimate concepts and methods.

Effrat (1972) contends, however, that Kuhn's theoretical speculations on paradigms and paradigm shift are useful, but "too rational" and his revolutions are "too bloodless." Rather, Effrat, argues that "scientific schools seem more akin to ideological movements. . . . That scientific discourse and activity is more like ideological polemics . . . in effect, that scientific conflict is a form of ideological warfare" (p. 11).

While I am largely in agreement with this critique, a number of implications should be made explicit. The first concerns the need for caution, for radical skepticism about any theoretical school's popularity, access to public relations, and institutional power bases, as well as to the theory's explanatory and predictive power. A second would suggest, in Effrat's words, "the need to examine a paradigm, or theoretical perspective, for its core values and philosophical roots in order to gain insight into the perspective" and, perhaps, to develop insight into unexamined implications of the theory. A third implication concerns the need for adherents to advance their theoretical school's relative standing vis-a-vis competing paradigms, or, in general, to develop one's school as far as possible both logically and empirically, and, when possible, to co-opt and subsume other theoretical positions.

In the field of social change, the long dominant "equilibrium" paradigm has, in this regard, come under increasing attack by adherents of conflict theory (Horton, 1966: Applebaum, 1970: Zaltman, 1973: et al.). And as educational change is commonly viewed as a part of the larger field of social change, this competition between the equilibrium and conflict orientations has recently also emerged in attempts to explain educational-reform efforts from the perspective of both paradigms (Collins, 1971: Vaughan and Archer, 1971; Kazamias and Schwartz, 1973: Simonds, 1973: Levin, August, 1974: and Zachariah, 1975).

The "equilibrium" paradigm is generally viewed as encompassing a number of different theories, or causal models, that focus on particular questions, methods, and phenomena while all share certain core assumptions about social reality, values, and research methods (Sorokin, 1936; Russett, 1966). Evolutionary and neo-evolutionary theories, for example, draw on notions of biological evolution and "explain" social and educational change largely in terms of progression to higher stages of social and cultural differentiation and specialization (Persons, 1950; Steward, 1955; Schneider, 1961: G. Wilson, 1965; King, 1966: Isard, 1975). Functionalist theory is more concerned with harmonious relations between the components of social systems and emphasizes smooth,

cumulative change (Emerson, 1954). Attempts to apply systems models in educational-change efforts draw on key notions from both neo-evolutionary and functionalist theory to explain relationships within the educational system and between the educational system and its socioeconomic context (Buckley, 1967: Bertalanffy, 1968).

Theories that cluster more or less within the conflict paradigm emphasize the inherent instability of social systems and the conflicts over values, resources, and power that follow as a natural consequence. Marxists and neo-Marxists emphasize economic conflict: students of cultural revitalization processes are primarily concerned with conflicting value and cultural systems: and writers using anarchistic-utopian frameworks are variously concerned with conflict arising from oppressive institutions and imperfect human nature.

With this brief introduction, we shall now turn to a more detailed examination of what the literature can tell us about these eight conceptual frameworks on educational change.

EVOLUTIONARY AND NEO-EVOLUTIONARY THEORY

Classical evolutionary theories are strongly influenced by Darwin's work on biological evolution and seek sociological analogues to the living organism (L. Ward, 1904: Parsons, 1964). They are characterized by notions of progress, by stages of development from lower- to higher-order forms. Society is viewed as an organism with specialized structures facilitating survival. Education, as an "integrative" structure, functions to maintain stability and changes from "simple" or "primitive" forms to more complex "modern" forms in response to change in other structures. Thus as societies "progress" or become increasingly differentiated (here evolutionists borrow the biologists' exact terminology), educational systems come under increasing pressure to specialize and adapt.

As a post-hoc description of social change, evolutionary theory failed to square with the mass of anthropological data accumulated before World War I. With decolonization and the rise of quasi-evolutionary "modernization" theories in the post-World War II period, anthropologists and others attempted to rework evolutionary theory as, for example, in the work of Steward, White, Sahlins,

Tax, and Dobzhansky, among others as cited in Stewart, 1955: Leontief, 1963: Hempel, 1966: Rhodes, 1968: Applebaum, 1970; and Phillips, 1971. Neo-evolutionists have sought to deal with cultural diversity through shifts from unilinear to multilinear change process, and with efforts to account for both diversity and cumulative change (Shipman, 1971: Aran, 1972).

Although there is no theory of educational change rooted directly in evolutionary theory per se, it is of interest to note Durkheim's (1956) proposal of over 50 years ago for scientific study to ascertain the "laws' governing evolutionary change in educational systems:

> Educational practices are not phenomena that are isolated from one another: rather, for a given society, they are bound up in the same system all the parts of which contribute toward the same end: it is the system of education suitable to this country and to this time. Each people hase its own, as it has its own moral, religious, economic system, etc. But on the other hand, peoples of the same kind; that is to say, people who resemble one another with respect to essential characteristics of their constitutions, should practice comparable systems of education. The similarities in their general organization should necessarily lead to others of equal importance in their educational organization. Consequently, through comparison, by abstracting the similarities and eliminating the differences from them, one can certainly establish the generic types of education which correspond to the different types of societies. . . . Once the types were established, we would have to explain them, that is to say, to seek out the conditions on which the characteristic traits of each of them depended, and how they have emerged from one another. One would thus obtain the laws which govern the evolution of systems of education. One would be able to perceive, then, both how education developed and what the causes are which have determined this development and which account for it (pp. 95-98).

Evolutionary theory in education, according to Durkheim, will be most useful as a framework to facilitate comparisons and the linking-up of the stages of social evolution, or development, on the one side, and the corresponding "generic" types of education, or stages of educational development, on the other side.

Durkheim's call to relate social and educational evolution has recently received recognition from a number of scholars studying various aspects of educational "progress" and "modernization." Wilson, for example (1973), has tried "to identify a set of criteria upon which the evolutionary stages of education may be established and to trace in broad outline a sequence of evolutionary stages of education from the least developed cultures to the most advanced" (p. 11). He argues that: "functional requisites at a given level of culture... make a particular type of education necessary for that culture to exist." He seeks "to establish causes" to account for the emergence of eight types of education, but is unable to do so and concludes by claiming no more for an "evolutionary theory of education" than that it "provides us with insights and understandings about the nature of education which could not be obtained by other approaches" (p. 258).

Thomas (1968) has identified four theories of instruction embodied in four different types of schooling: i.e., memorizing, training, intellect developing, and problem solving. Each type is viewed as having "integrity, distinctive emphasis, and logical coherence." Although Thomas, in contrast to Wilson, makes no direct claim for multilinear evolution of school types, he proposes a research agenda that frames a number of questions in neo-evolutionary perspective. "What characteristics of a society--economic, policital, and cultural--appear to be associated, in ways that suggest consequential relationships, with long-established schools of a distinctive type. Which type of schooling at advanced levels is most often associated... with autocratic leadership... self-reliant entrepreneurs... rebellions and revolutions?" (p. 24).

The answers, Thomas contends, will be found in the hypothetical relations of types of schooling to the significant dimensions on which national societies differ: i.e., from a traditional and authoritarian stage with "cultural resistance

to technological innovation" to an implicitly superior, open, democratic and pluralistic stage characterized by "enthusiasm for innovation, creativity... and cultural eagerness for technological advance" (pp. 15, 32).

Where Thomas proposes a causal sequence between type (and implied stage) of schooling and national development, Beeby (1966) argues that "there are certain stages of growth through which all school systems must pass; although a system may be helped to speed up its progress, it cannot leapfrog a stage or a major portion of a stage because its position on the stage of development is determined by two factors, the level of general education of the teachers, and the amount of training they have received" (p. 69). Thus, Beeby presents a unilinear evolutionary model of stages in the growth of any primary-school system.

Kimball (1960), an educational anthropologist, contends that Darwin's natural-history approach is of "immense significance" in understanding the enterprise of education, as well as in "the crisis of reforming our educational system to conform to the realities of an ever-changing world." He forcefully argues that "the full impact of Darwin's contribution to education has yet to be realized. It is to be found in the application of the method of natural history to the method and theory of education." Kimball views major tenets of the method as follows: "Change is the law of life.... insistence upon the orderliness of the universe... recognition that the physical, organic, and cultural worlds constitute systems, and within each of them there is a great variety of sub-systems, all of which contain their own internal logics and dynamics" (pp. 73-74). In sum, according to Kimball, Darwin's natural-history method provides a method <u>par excellence</u> for obtaining, organizing, and transmitting knowledge: i.e., "a method of understanding change" as well as, more explicitly, a method that "can be utilized to modernize our educational system" (p. 73).

Prescriptions for educational-change strategies from evolutionary and neo-evolutionary perspectives can only be viewed as having, at best, little utility for educational planners and reformers attempting to descend from the heights

of generality and intuition to the concreteness of specific needs to change priorities and programs. The theory is difficult to test, it explains little, and it is virtually useless for prediction (Rhodes, 1968; D. C. Phillips, 1975). In addition, evolutionary assumptions about the unidimensionality of modernization processes (Butts, 1967; Cohen, 1970) seem clearly refuted by the recent efforts in a number of developing countries to radically reform and restructure their educational systems in ways that are largely unrelated to educational practice in the developed countries.

STRUCTURAL FUNCTIONAL THEORY

Although the structural-functional, or S/F, framework is a discrete set of interrelated assumptions about values, norms, and appropriate questions and methods, it is to a considerable degree a twentieth-century version of evolutionary theory. But where the evolutionists placed primary emphasis on linked stages of socioeconomic and cultural development, the S/F theorists focus on the homeostatic or balancing mechanisms by which societies maintain a "uniform state." Both theories view socieities as essentially stable yet highly complex and differentiated. As the values embodied in institutions such as the educational subsystem are viewed as extremely durable, boundary exchanges between the subsystem and the environment will be equilibrating, i.e., they will tend toward "balance."

Both evolutionary and S/F theorists share a strong conservative bias toward the undesirability of all but "adaptive" change. A system imbalance should require no more than small incremental adjustments. Major forces for change are, accordingly, viewed as essentially exogenous to the system, and intrasystem conflict is usually viewed as pathological, as an indicator of systemic breakdown.

We should also note that S/F theorists and those proposing change in social and educational systems using S/F orientations not only accept gross inequality in society, but see it as a necessary condition to maintain the existing normative order. Davis (1949) has captured this core belief of the

S/F world view is his statement that "social inequality... is an unconsciously evolved device by which societies insure that the most important positions are conscientiously filled by the most qualified persons" (p. 367). Thus the attainment of rewards of power and privilege is viewed as a function of the degree to which people are able to contribute, and as people necessarily differ in motivation and endowment, inequality is accordingly inevitable. For functionalists, inequality as reflected by social and educational stratification arises basically out of the needs of societies, not out of the vested interests of individuals or groups (Lenski, 1966). Thus, functionalists contend that inequality is not only inevitable, but necessary and beneficial to all since individual survival is contingent on the survival and well-being of society (Easton, 1956).

As the dominant social-change orientation in American social science for the past half-century or so, S/F theory--and its refined version in systems theory--has powerfully influenced American views of how educational systems function and why they change, as well as what are appropriate and valid educational-reform goals, strategies, and tactics.

The sociologist Talcott Parsons has in this regard written extensively from both evolutionary and structural-functional perspectives concerning pattern maintenance and change in education. There is, in addition, an extensive literature built on Parsons' general model and on attempts to operationalize it in numerous case studies of educational "modernization" (Adams, 1970; Larkin, 1970; Shipman, 1971). At the individual level, Parsons views education as the process by which, through special institutional arrangements and formal procedures, individuals come to "know," "command," and/or become "committed to" important elements of the cultural tradition of the society. At the social-system level, schools as pattern-maintenance institutions lack autonomy and are heavily dependent on the larger society for resources and legitimation. Society, in exchange, depends on schools to continue the socialization begun by the family and thus to provide intergenerational continuity, a necessary condition for societal survival.

According to the structural-functionist view, when change or reform occurs in the educational subsystem, it is the result of interaction between society and the schools and follows in some five steps: (1) a need arises in society: (2) the school is assigned the task of meeting the need: (3) change in the educational structure takes place to accommodate the new function: (4) the new role is assumed by schools: and (5) latent and manifest changes take place in society as a consequence of the new educational functions. Thus schools may introduce significant changes into society, but because schools are only passively related to social change, they serve essentially conservative functions and tend to reinforce the status quo (Hopper, 1968). And efforts of educational reformers to use schools in meliorative ways will, accordingly,be largely unsuccessful. As Larkin (1970) notes, S/F theory maintains that: "the school is not and cannot be an innovator because of its dependency relationship to the larger society. Educators cannot institute change without the consent of the voters.... No matter how much funded knowledge and research indicate the necessity for change, programs must be acceptable to the public. Because the success of an educational program depends on wide public acceptance. it is difficult for innovation to occur in education" (p. 119).

Given the constraints on substantial educational reform, and because the vast majority of U. S. educational planners and reformers subscribe to these guiding S/F assumptions, educational-reform efforts in the U. S. as well as those under U. S. control overseas have essentially sought incremental alterations in existing systems (USAID, 1973: World Bank, 1973). This effort to bring educational programs into more harmonious relations with socioeconomic development efforts at the national level is, perhaps, best illustrated by the use of human-capital theory to explain educational change during the 1970s. This development strategy builds on neo-evolutionary and S/F theory while focusing on the educational sector's critical role in preparing skilled manpower, innovators, entrepreneurs, and the like for social-economic modernization, using Western models, and for economic growth using neoclassical market analysis (Becker, 1960; Schultz, 1961: Anderson and Bowman, 1965; Vaizey, 1972: Harbison, 1975).

Efforts to use human-capital theory to guide educational-reform efforts in the recent so-called "War on Poverty" in the U. S. and in U. S. technical-assistance projects abroad have produced a vast literature which in varying degrees attempts to wed general equilibrium theory in economics to S/F theory in the area of social change. The theory's concern with the rate of return to human capital places a primary responsibility on education in schools, or in non-formal educational programs, and on learning in the family to contribute toward "human-resource" development. The task of educational reform is, accordingly, to facilitate investment in personal development and to produce "better" workers within the context of the existing educational and social systems. As the distribution of income is largely viewed as a function of labor-supply conditions, the expansion of educational opportunity will, according to human-capital theory, increase the ability of education to equalize competition for economic resources (Simmons, 1974).

Human-capital theory, as a branch of capital theory, views each student and worker as a proto-capitalist, and avoids mention of structured inequality, cultural differences, social-class hierarchies, and class conflicts. Moreover, it generally assumes social consensus concerning the national ideology, the legitimacy of the social hierarchy, and the allocation of rewards and resources. As such, human-capital theory is anathema to U. S. Marxists and socialists who reject the notion that educational reform, or more commonly, educational innovations, reflect responses to the market's demand for technically defined skills.

SYSTEMS THEORY

General systems theory represents an attempt to build on the fields of biology, cybernetics, and information and communication theory in order to move beyond the conceptual and explanatory limitations of S/F theory (Bertalanffy, 1962· Cadwallader, 1968). Widespread efforts to apply notions of systems theory to describe and predict educational-change phenomena during the past 15 years have also been concerned with developing systems analysis as a technique for decision-making and for innovation in school systems (Watson,

1967; D. K. Cohen, 1975; Pareek, 1975). As such, the theory applied to education falls outside of this review. The systems perspective, however, has also occasionally been used in the diagnosis and planning of national and regional educational-reform efforts, and in this regard we will need to briefly note basic assumptions of the approach as it relates to large-scale educational-change efforts (Adams, 1970; Morgan, 1971; Wirosuhardjo, 1971; Balchin, 1973; Elboim-Dror, 1975).

Bushnell's (1971) work, "Planned Change in Education: A Systems Approach," offers an illustrative summary of assumptions and "constructive alternatives" underlying the claims of systems theory to hold promise for a "more rapid adaptation of our public schools to the demands of a modern society."

From the systems perspective, the need for change arises with evidence of system "malfunctioning." Using the example of a stock-market broker, Bushnell presents an "information flow model" to provide the structure or network of communication flow between all participants in the school system from students to taxpayers. Given this precondition, six steps are proposed as a "research and development" change "process."

The recent OECD four-volume study of strategies for innovation (CERI, 1973) critically examines and assesses case studies of change efforts in a number of North American and Western European countries that have used the "R & D" or systems model. This work is a major advance on studies to date that have used the systems model. It is comparative, it examines innovations and reforms at the school, regional, and national levels, and it attempts to assess the political, administrative, and organizational dimensions of educational-change processes.

When one examines the vast literature on educational-change efforts in the past several decades or so, it is clear that the research and development model in vogue during the 1960s largely concentrated on the change process in isolation and continues to ignore the problem of who determines a system "malfunction" (Oettinger, 1969). Herzog (quoted in CERI, 1973) criticizes the systems model

as being "naively profession-o-centric" in viewing "schools as objects to be manipulated." Systems approaches, he contends, "fail to recognize that most people are attached to whatever they are doing because they believe in the value of it, not because they are resistant to change" (p. 37), and when systems approaches are used in technical-assistance efforts overseas, the problem is often compounded by chauvinism as well. Leontief (1963), a pioneer in input-output analysis, claims, for example, that "the process of development consists essentially in the installation and building of an approximation of the system embodied in the advanced economies of the U. S. and Western Europe, and more recently, of the USSR" (p. 159). Only rarely have those involved in planning change attempted to identify, include, and operationalize contextual variables such as competing ideologies, power, vested interests, and the like, which might question the conservative notions of equilibrium and consensus inherent in the functionalist-cum-systems perspective (Smith, 1973; Bentzen, 1974).

Fox and Schacter and Fox (1975) have attempted to refine and advance systems theory in ways that will permit dynamic descriptions of structural-change processes. They argue that "structural change is the sine qua non of true growth, yet models that predict structural change have not been developed" (p. 41). The problem, they contend, lies largely in the limitations of applied systems theory where "traditional input-out analysis carries with it the burdens of: (1) the assumption of linearity, (2) the requirements of quasi-stationary time series and of data, good in quantity and quality, (3) its intrinsically descriptive, non-projective characteristic, i.e., it has no provision for predicting structural change, (4) its assumption of the U. S. economy as a normative goal of development, and (5) its positivist orientation, that is, it provides no insight into mechanisms of the socio-economy--it is a black-box, operational method" (p. 41).

In a broad critique of the equilibrium paradigm, Smith (1973) perceptively analyzes the post-1960 work of neo-evolutionists and S/F theorists that tries to account for violence, conflict, and revolution, i.e., the phenomena that functionalism has been accused of neglecting while concentrating on value-

integration and continuity in social forms via "moving equilibrium." Despite efforts by S. N. Eisenstadt (Aran, 1972), T. Parsons (Larkin, 1970), and N. Smelser (1971), among others, to elaborate new, more powerful evolutionary accounts of social change (i.e., change viewed as an endogenous, cumulative process of natural growth arising inevitably out of the social structures' inherent tendency toward differentiation of parts, ensuring strains and tensions, and adaptive reintegrations that are in effect social change, etc.), Smith (1973) convincingly argues that all the liabilities of functionalism as an explanatory framework also attend these neo-evolutionary efforts.

He argues that their "frozen" evolutionism presents only the illusion of accounting for social change. It is unable to account for exogenous factors and novelty in social form, to demonstrate significant relationships, to show the mechanism of historical transition, or to describe the pathway of change, its causes, rates of change, or other key variables. Instead, he argues, it offers only comparative statistics and "the comforting illusion of accounting for social change" (p. 7).

Critics have also faulted the use of equilibrium theories supporting development efforts in African, Asian, and Latin American contexts on the grounds that they are, inter alia: (1) ethnocentric; (2) either grand theorizing innocent of local historical knowledge, or abstracted empiricism; (3) trivial; and (4) unable to account for mutative changes which overthrow the rules of the game by which the social system maintains and legitimizes existing ideology and structures. Friedman's (1963) critique of an equilibrium model in economics underscores something of the difficulty in attempts to ground educational-change efforts in this perspective. He contends that "the model may be useful for analysis, but it ceases to be pertinent when it is converted to a normative rule for planning. To be meaningful, every social norm must be brought into concrete relation with the historical conditions of collective life. That static equilibrium mode, valid only within a parameter of carefully stated and artificial assumptions, is wholly inappropriate by this standard" (p. 72).

THE CONFLICT PARADIGM AND THE NOTION OF ENDEMIC STRESS/CHANGE

Studies of socioeconomic, cultural, and educational change using variants of conflict theory have increased significantly during the past decade or so (Dahrendorf, 1959; Zeitlin, 1968; Allardt, 1971; Collins, 1971; Young, 1971; Boudon, 1974; Carnoy, 1974 and 1976; Dreir, 1975). This work may be roughly divided into three types of conflict "theory"--i.e., (1) Marxist and neo-Marxist explanations of socioeconomic conflict, (2) cultural revival or revitalization explanations of value conflict, and (3) the somewhat mixed bag of anarchist and anarchist-utopian views of institutional conflict and constraints on human development. It may also be further subdivided into studies that seek to extend and refine conflict theory per se, and those analytical and descriptive efforts to apply conflict theory so as to "explain" educational-change processes and outcomes in concrete settings.

MARXIST AND NEO-MARXIST THEORY

Marxist theory, by and large, has always been viewed as a legitimate philosophical and theoretical system in Western Europe, regardless of one's ideological orientation. Accordingly, it is not surprising to find a flourishing body of Western European reform studies--especially in West Germany, France, and Great Britain--using both Marxist and neo-Marxist frames to study the political economy of education and educational-reform efforts to ask the key question of cui bono, or "who benefits?" (Simon, 1965; Bourdieu, 1970 and 1973; Altvater, 1971; Klafki, 1971; Young, 1971; Vaughan and Archer, 1971; Huisken, 1972; Berufeld, 1973; Heinrich, 1973; Masuch, 1973; Rubenstein and Simon, 1973; Boudon, 1974; Forfatterkollektiv, 1975; Kallós, 1975; Tourmaine, 1975).

In the United States, in marked contrast, Marxist perspectives on social and educational change have been largely rejected and/or ignored (Davis, 1959, p. 761; Dunkel, 1972). Although this tradition continues, there is a growing if limited and begrudging academic acceptance of analysis using neo-Marxist perspectives in the study of social and educational change and the sociology of development (Gintis, 1971, 1972; Bowles, 1972; Carnoy, 1973, 1974, 1975; Frank, 1973; Levin, 1973, 1974; Collins, 1975; Genovese, 1975; Zachariah, 1975; Paulston, 1976).

Although all variants of conflict theory reject the evolutionists' and functionalists' image of society as a system of benign self-regulating mechanisms where maintenance of social equilibrium and harmony is "functional" and disruption of harmony is "dysfunctional," only Marxism as social-science theory is linked with policy prescriptions for revolutionary change from below. The emphasis on power, exploitation, contradictions, and the like the the Marxist dialectical approach has several important implications for our question concerning the preconditions for educational change. Formal education is here viewed as a part of the ideological structure which a ruling class controls to maintain its control of knowledge, and, thus, its privilege and cultural hegemony. And because formal education is dependent on the dominant economic and political institutions, it cannot be a primary agent of social transformation. . . it can only follow changes in the imperatives of the economic and political social order (Gramsci, 1957; Zachariah, 1975).

Levin (1975) argues in the same vein that changes in the educational sector will parallel and follow from changes or contradictions in a society's economic, political, and social relationships. If school-reform movements violate "the percepts of the polity. . . they either failed to be adopted, or failed to show results." Thus, he argues, many attempts to individualize instruction failed because they violated "the need for conformity and class-related interchange ability among individuals in the hierarchical organizations that characterize both industry and government in our society." In like manner, "Compensatory Education" for youth from low-income families fails because "schools are not going to succeed in reducing the competitive edge of the advantaged over the disadvantaged in the race for income and status." The "desegregation" of schooling fails for similar reasons, and attempts to equalize the financial support of the schools "will also fail since society regards the ability to provide a better educational background a privilege of the rich rather than a right of every citizen. In short, only when there is a demand for educational change by the polity, will educational reform succeed. The historical record bears out, he contends, that the "turning points" in the functions of schools coincide with major improvements (Callahan, 1962; Katz, 1971) that changed the social order" (p. 316).

From the Marxist dialectical perspective, national reforms will only take place when they are viewed by dominant political and economic elites as defending or advancing their interest vis-a-vis less-privileged groups in society. High wastage rates, for example, are viewed as "malfunctions," i.e., as a technical problem by structural functionalists. Marxists, in contrast, are more likely to view this problem as a part of a control process where dropouts are taught to accept the responsibility for their failure and their disqualification in competition for power, status, and consumption, while the winners will tend to defend and continue the status quo (Carter, 1975). From S/F and human-capital perspectives, schools carry out socialization for competence (Inkeles, 1966). Marxists, however, see schooling linked to the social relations of production. Inequalities in school experiences are, accordingly, viewed as differential socialization to meet the demands of hierarchical societies (Gramsci, 1959: Bowles, 1972: Bernfeld, 1973). Educational-reform efforts in non-socialist countries that are not accompanied by efforts to change the structured social relation of production are, accordingly, explained as just one more use of public institutions to enable the few to maintain a self-serving hegemony (Katz, 1968, 1971: Paulston, 1971: Karier, 1973, 1975: Carnoy, 1974).

In addition to its political liabilities as an alternative paradigm of why and how social and educational change takes place, Marxist and neo-Marxist theory--i.e., Marxist analysis that rejects such metaphysical and deterministic notions as "historical inevitability" and "class struggle" and largely settles for study of interest-group conflict (R. Dahrendorf, 1965: Dreir, 1975) also has serious problems in operationalizing key concepts (Smelser, 1971).

Yet, despite its dogmatic aspects and conceptual limitations, neo-Marxist theory applied to problems of social and educational change has contributed much to discredit equilibrium explanations of reform rationales and outcomes. With its primary focus on economic and political relations, however, Marxist and neo-Marxist theory have been notably unable to account for cultural/conflict and change phenomena. another area of conflict theory to which we now turn.

CULTURAL REVIVAL AND SOCIAL MOVEMENT THEORY

In comparison to the rapidly growing body of work on socio-educational reform grounded in Marxist theory and its variants, the literature on culture change and culture conflict applied to educational change is exceedingly sparse. It may be recalled that S/F theory assumes a high degree of normative consensus across social systems, while Marxist theory posits normative consensus or an ethos shared across major social groups--i.e., the working class, the middle class, and conflict between classes. Cultural-revitalization theory, in contrast, focuses not on social classes but, according to Wallace (1956), on "deliberate organized conscious efforts by members of a society to construct a more satisfying culture." Such efforts are viewed as constantly recurring phenomena, a type of culture-creating activity in collective efforts of varying size which seeks social and cultural change that may take place at local or national levels. This activity has considerable potential for both conflict and social change (Simon, 1965; Allardt, 1971; Paulston, 1972; LaBelle, 1973). In contrast to more gradual culture-change processes as exemplified by evolution, acculturation, and diffusion of innovations, cultural-revitalization efforts may be viewed as attempts to innovate not merely discrete elements, but largely new cultural systems specifying new social norms and behaviors (Goodenough, 1963). Wallace (1956), for example, contends that revitalization movements, as a form of collective action, occur under two conditions: high stress for individual members of society and disillusionment with a distorted cultural Gestalt. Where such processes take place as in "mass movements," "messianic movements," "ethnic movements," or "revolutionary movements," they all require members to profess adherence to the movement's ideology or evaluative principles about the ends and means of human action, and emphasize the need to reduce stress through collective efforts for change (Anderson, 1968).

Revitalization movements are relevant to this discussion because they may influence educational-change efforts in both steady-state and revolutionary societies. In the first situation, groups undergoing cultural revival or revitalization processes in conservative/liberal societies may reject formal public schooling for their young because it conflicts with their new cognitive and evaluative models, their ideology and aspirations for new social norms and relations (Itzkoff,

1969: LaBelle, 1975; Paulston, 1976). Shalaby's The Education of a Black Muslim (1972), for example, describes how innovative formal and non-formal educational programs created by the Black Muslim movement differ greatly from the education experienced by most American blacks in formal schools. Additional examples are the rejection of schooling as a means of resistance to acculturation by, for example, members of the native American and Chicano movements in North America today and by the Kikuyu School Movement before independence in Kenya. When the requisite resources and tolerance are available, culture-building movements may also seek to create alternative schools, or educational systems, educational settings where learning will be under movement control and shaped and infused by the movement's ideology and views of social injustice and culture conflicts as well as its new values, hopes, and dreams (Paulston, 1974, 1975; Adams, 1975; Paulston and LeRoy, 1975).

In the second situation, i.e., where a revolutionary-cum-revitalization movement has successfully captured political power in a nation, both formal and non-formal education will be extended and fundamentally altered in systematic educational-change efforts to implant and legitimize the new value system (Anderson, 1968; Allardt, 1971; Paulston, 1972; Wallace, 1973).

From a related, but more prescriptive orientation, Horton (1973) contends that significant structural change in educational systems will always be a function of the emergence of mass underdog movements seeking to put a radically different cultural system into practice. His strategy for educational reform draws on both the theory and experience of cultural movements seeking change from below:

> We should have learned by now that fundamental restructuring will not occur in response to outcries against inadequacies of the present system or according to elite blueprints for change. Advocacy alone... has never brought about radical change. We have learned from the folk schools in this country and abroad, from Paulo Freire and others like him, and from the great popular movements of this Century, that people become motivated when

> they are personally involved in processes relating directly to them and their own life situations. . . . Thus, the only way to effect radical changes in the educational system is for educators to make alliances. . . with community people, students, various ethnic groups, union members. . . . Goals, curriculum, and policy. . . will be changed to the degree more and more people begin participating in decision making and become agents of fundamental change in the educational system and society at large (p. 340).

ANARCHISTIC AND UTOPIAN THEORY

Anarchistic and utopian theories of social change often share the Marxian goal of radical social transformation, and concerns of cultural revival and revitalization movements for individual renewal. In marked contrast to all other previously noted theories seeking to explain and predict educational-change, they rarely bother to validate their call to reform with the findings and methods of social science, or to put their theory into practice (Idenberg, 1974). Accordingly, utopian visions of educational transformation for a radically reordered world may influence the general dabate on needs and priorities for educational change, but they are for the most part rejected by politicians and professionals responsible for assessing the feasibility and desirability of educational-reform strategies (Livingstone, 1973). The utopians' often insightful critiques of existing inequalities and "evils" in education may serve to provoke impassioned discussion (Rusk, 1971; Marin, 1975), but utopian analysis only rarely takes into account how existing oppressive power relationships and lack of tolerance for "deviance" or change in any given social setting will influence reform efforts of whatever scope or magnitude. Typically, the utopians begin with a critical analysis of socio-educational reality and rather quickly wind up in a dream world. Although few roads lead from their models to reality, the utopians' prescriptive work has been valuable as a spur to debate on the constraints that would-be educational reformers must recognize if their plans, as well, are to be more than utopian pious "dreams."

Proposals for radically altered educational goals, programs, and out comes that fit somewhere in this cell burgeoned during the past decade but now seem to be in decline. Reimer (1970) suggested alternative schools to help achieve "a peaceful revolution." Earlier, Goodman (1960) proposed that real-life encounters, or learning in the context of adult transactions (i.e., the Greek Paideia), and development of critical awareness are the best ways to prepare effective, knowledgeable citizens. Thus professions and trades would be learned in their practice and not in schools where knowledge is often divorced both from its origins and applications and therefore, from the utopian view, creates an alienating relationship between life and learning.

Illich (1971 and elsewhere) has refined and extended this critique of schooling with epigrammatic brilliance and paradoxical insight. He argues that political revolutionaries are shortsighted in their goals for educational reform because they want only "to improve existing institutions--their productivity and the quality and distribution of their products. The political revolutionary concentrates on schooling and tooling for the environment that the rich countries, socialist and capitalist, have engineered. The cultural revolutionary risks the future on the educability of man" (pp. 172-73).

For Illich, meaningful educational reform means abolition of the formal school's monopoly on education and the creation of new ways to link work, life, and learning in such new educational approaches as "learning webs," "skill exchanges," and "reference services." Thus, he contends that meaningful educational reform will only take place following the abolition of schooling, certainly a utopian and somewhat simpliste demand if schools are viewed as thevery keystone to the defense, legitimation, and perpetuation of privilege. This and other basic contraditions in Illich's strategy for educational change have been critically discussed in a number of recent telling attacks (Gartner, 1974; Manners, 1975).

Where Illich sees the elimination of schooling as a necessary precondition for the millenium, Reimer (1971), Freire (1973), and Galtung (1975) view "true" education--i.e., becoming critically aware of one's reality in a manner that leads to effective action upon it, as a basic force for revolutionary social renewal.

Reimer's "rationalist" strategy for utopia, for example, calls for the redistribution of educational resources in an inverse ratio to present privilege; the prohibition of educational monopoly; universal access to educational resources; and the decentralization of power. This latter condition, according to Reimer, "rules out political revolution." Instead of a political revolution with its "history of betrayal," Reimer proposes a deus ex machina of "peaceful revolution... in which the nominal holders of power discover that they have lost their power before they begin to fight" (p. 139).

Freire's central message is that one can only know in proportion to the extent that one "problematizes" the natural, cultural, and historical reality in which one is immersed. In contrast to the technocrat's "problem-solving" concerns for education where students become expert in detached analysis, Freire advocates education where an entire populace (with leadership contributions from sympathetic members of the privileged classes!) attempts to codify total reality into symbols which can generate critical consciousness and empower them to alter their relations with both natural and social forces.

Such educational efforts seeking to facilitate the "maximum of potential consciousness" in the emerging masses take place in two stages: as "cultural action for freedom" when it occurs in opposition to the "dominating power elite;" and as "cultural revolution" when it takes place in harmony with a newly dominant revolutionary regime.

As all conflict theories of educational change are essentially a view of the whole from the part, they are all more concerned with educational change seeking greater equity and justice. It may be appropriate to close this review with a comment on Adam Curle's recent book, Education for Liberation (1973). Here Curle describes his earlier work on educational-planning efforts that were framed largely in equilibrium and human-capital views of social reality and the "appropriate" economic- and educational-change strategies that follow from these perspectives. Curle concedes there is some truth in the hypothesis that because education also inculcates the attitudes and skills which increase productivity, the more education, the more wealth: "but the arguments are complex, ambiguous and, moreover, now irrelevant to me because I have reached an understanding of development of which the keystone is justice rather than wealth" (p. 1).

Curle now views all school systems as more or less contributory to the continuation of structured inequality, environmental pollution, and racial disharmonies. "Instead of being hopeful about education, I began to see it in its total effect to be hostile to what I see as development." As "education enslaves" and people "become free through their own efforts," the direction of educational change should, according to Curle, be toward increasing the awareness levels of youth and adults in existing schools.

His change strategy calls for the conscious development of the "counter system," which exists, he contends, within "each one of us" and within the dominant institutional system as well. He describes "the system"at the individual, psychological level as characterized by greed and aggression, and at the national level by power and exploitation networks that dominate human relationships. The "counter-system," in contrast, is characterized as "democracy in its ideal and virtually unknown form" (p. 10).

Although Curle uses a conflict diagnosis and suggests that educational changes in the counter-system may have "some effect" in undermining the system, he rejects efforts to mobilize the losers and openly press for the elimination of structured violence and exploitation.

Thus, Curle, as do the other utopians, presents compelling arguments for more humane schooling and more equitable life chances. But as a convert to the conflict paradigm his position is, to say the least, ambivalent. On the one hand, he readily acknowledges conflict in educational and social relations. On the other, his prescriptions for school reform are quitessentially utopian and avoid the realities of how elites maintain privilege through control of economic relations and social institutions.

With the partial acceptance of neo-Marxist descriptive theory, and to a less extent its predictive theory as well, a number of essentially liberal technical-assistance organizations such as the Ford Foundation, the World Bank, et al., are also to some degree now caught in Curle's dilemma of using the conflict frame for diagnosis and the equilibrium world view as the basis for their normative theory (Clignet, 1974: House, 1974: Simmons, 1975; Silvert, 1976: Stevens, 1976). This difficult balancing act calls for increased attention to the need for a new dialectical

viewpoint drawing on both equilibrium and conflict paradigms, a difficult task now underway (Coser, 1956: Berghe, 1963; Lenski, 1966: Schermerhorn, 1970: Galtung, 1975).

PART III

CONCLUSIONS

A. Concerning the power of existing theories to explain and predict educational-change phenomena.

In this work, I have attempted to demonstrate how a selective review of the literature can be used to cluster explanatory studies of induced social and educational change. Each of these theoretical orientations is seen, moreover, as demonstrated in Figure 1, to hold fairly predictable assumptions about educational-reform needs, priorities, and the like. Thus, one may conjecture that proposals for reform strategies have not been random and eclectic. Rather, personal bias leads people to a number of possible theoretical and ideological orientations from which assumptions about why and when reforms should take place and what reform priorities and processes, if any, should be chosen, logically follow. All this is to say that many unspecified theoretical and ideological axes are ground in educational-change and reform studies, but, unfortunately, little of this is ever acknowledged or made explicit.

The literature also demonstrates a number of additional deficiencies:

(1) few students come to grips with the concept of power in either the political and administrative or research and development phases of national reforms. As outcomes of structural-change efforts are functions of power and power-based activities, this can only be seen as a basic limitation.

(2) As major change is always a partisan, political process implying redistribution of power, the lack of attempts to specify ideological, interest-group, and other conflicts means that most reform studies present a narrow, unsophisticated and largely "technical" assessment of why and how change takes place. Most studies avoid specification of "external" factors that lead to conflict over reform priorities. Nor do many reform studies analyze how existing ideologies "justify" structured inequality and influence reform processes as

Figure 1

RELATIONS BETWEEN THEORIES OF SOCIAL AND EDUCATIONAL CHANGE/"REFORM"

Social Change		Illustrative Linked Assumptions Concerning Educational-Change Potentials and Processes			
Paradigms	"Theories"	Re Preconditions for Educational Change	Re Rationales for Educational Change	Re Scope and Process of Educational Change	Re Major Outcomes Sought
Equilibrium	Evolutionary	State of evolutionary readiness	Pressure to move to a higher evolutionary stage	Incremental and adaptive; "natural history" approach	New stage of institutional evolutional adaptation
	Neo-Evolutionary	Satisfactory completion of earlier stages	Required to support "national modernization" efforts	"Institution building" using Western models and technical assistance	New "higher" state of education and social differentiation/specialization
	Structural-Functionist	Altered functional and structural requisites	Social system need provoking an educational response; exogenous threats	Incremental adjustment of existing institutions, occasionally major	Continued "homeostasis" or "moving" equilibrium; "human capital" and national "development"
	Systems	Technical expertise in "systems management." "Rational decision making" and "needs assessment"	Need for greater efficiency in system's operation and goal achievement; i.e., response to a system "malfunction"	Innovative "problem solving" in existing systems: i.e., "Research and Development approach	Improved "efficiency" re costs/benefits; adoption of innovations
Conflict	Marxian	Elite's awareness of need for change, or shift of power to socialist rulers and educational reformers	To adjust correspondence between social relations of production and social relations of schooling	Adjustive incremental following social mutations or radical restructuring with Marxist predominance	Formation of integrated workers, i.e., the new "Socialist Man"
	Neo-Marxian	Increased political power and political awareness of working class	Demands for social justice and social equality	Large-scale national reforms through "democratic" institutions and processes	Eliminate "educational privilege" and "elitism"; create a more equalitarian society
	Cultural Revitalization	Rise of a collective effort to revive or create "a new culture." Social tolerance for "deviant" normative movements and their educational programs	Rejection of conventional schooling as forced acculturation. Education needed to support advance toward movement goals	Creation of alternative schools or educational settings. If movement captures polity, radical change in national educational ideology and structure	Inculcate new normative system. Meet movement's recruitment, training, and solidarity needs
	Anarchistic Utopian	Creation of supportive settings; growth of critical consciousness; social pluralism	Free man from institutional and social constraints. Enhance creativity need for "life-long learning"	Isolated "freeing up" of existing programs and institutions, or create new learning modes and settings, i.e., a "learning society"	Self-renewal and participation. Local control of resources and community; elimination of exploitation and alienation

groups seek to defend or maximize benefits at the expense of others within the system. All too often, conflicts arising from ideological differences or the clash of vested interest groups are either ignored or treated as technical problems.

(3) In like manner, reform studies all too often discuss reform-policy and goal statements as fact and have by and large failed to specify outcomes, or to evaluate if reforms have indeed helped to secure the effects sought. This need is especially evident in socialist societies where change efforts not only seek to inculcate what is usually a new collectivistic value system, with an attendant set of behaviors often at deviance with those rewarded and punished in previous regimes.

B. The state of the literature: Research gaps and needs

Given these deficiencies, of what use is existing literature for those who seek to advance our understanding of change processes, and to better inform and direct future educational-change efforts? Further studies of the literature are needed to extend and refine the typologizing processes described above as well as to advance the further generation of propositions or questions of causal inference about likely independent variables in the formulation, implementation, and assessment of change programs. Clearly, the present study--with its admittedly arbitrary categorization--is only a limited first step in what I hope will be a number of synthesizing investigations asking: (1) "under what conditions" nationwide educational-change efforts have occurred, and (2) how major reforms have, with a greater or lesser degree of success, supported significant change in norms, relationships, and movement toward national development objectives.

In sum, the literature can serve in a limited fashion to support inquiry concerning reform rationales and implementation processes. It cannot, however, yet support strong inference on reform effects: i.e., the extent to which educational change will significantly affect economic growth, social relations, increased participation or contribution to national development, and the like. If one seeks to generalize with greater precision and validity about possible educational-reform effects in structural and normative change, then it will first

be necessary to systematically study and compare a range of both successful and unsuccessful national educational-change efforts from both equilibrium and conflict perspectives in a variety of socio-economic and political contexts. Comparative research, thus, might seek to identify key variables influencing each stage of the educational-reform process, and to assess both intended and unintended outcomes. Such case-study evaluations of national educational-reform efforts using a common framework promise contributions to middle-range theory building--with the specification of testable generalizations about necessary and sufficient conditions for large-scale structural and normative change efforts. They should also be of value in efforts to elaborate a dialectical research perspective that is locked into neither functionalist nor conflict theory yet draws selectively and critically on each orientation.

REFERENCES

Adams, D. Education and Modernization in Asia. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1970.

Adams, F. Unearthing Seeds of Fire: The Idea of Highlander. Winston-Salem, N. C.: J. F. Blair, 1975.

Allardt, E. "Culture, Structure, and Revolutionary Ideologies." International Journal of Comparative Sociology 12 (March 1971):24-40.

Altvater, E., and Juisken, F., eds. Materialen zur politischen Ökonomie des Ausbildunssektors. Erlangen: Politladen, 1971.

Andersson, B. "Revitalization Movements: An Essay on Structure and Ideology in a Class of Exclusive Underdog Systems." Acta Universitatis Upsallienses 17 (1968):347-75.

Anderson, C. A., and Bowman, M. J., eds. Education and Economic Development. Chicago: Aldine, 1965.

Appelbaum, R. P. Theories of Social Change. Chicago: Markham, 1970.

Aran, L.: Eisenstadt, S. N.: and Adler, C. "The Effectiveness of Educational Systems in the Process of Modernization." Comparative Education Review 16 (February 1972): 30-43.

Balinski, W. L. and Senbet, L. W. A Framework for the Appraisal of Educational Systems. Institute of Management Science, Proceedings of the Ninth Annual Meeting, 1973, 367-373.

Becker, G. S. "Underinvestment in Education?" American Economic Review 50 (1960): 346-54.

Beeby, C. E. The Cuality of Education in Developing Countries. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1966.

Bentzen, M. M. Changing Schools: The Magic Feather Principle. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974.

Berger, P. L. "The Problem of Multiple Realities." In Phenomenology and Social Reality, edited by M. Nantanson, pp. 213-33. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1970.

Berghe, P. L. van den. "Dialectic and Functionalism: Toward a Theoretical Synthesis." American Sociological Review 28 (1963): 695-705.

Bernfeld, S. Sisyphus and the Limits of Education. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973.

Bertalanffy, L. von. "General Systems Theory: A Critical Review." In General Systems, Yearbook for the Society for General Systems Research 7 (1962):1-20.

Bertalanffy, L. von. General Systems Theory: Foundations, Development, Applications. New York: George Braziller, 1968.

Blackburn, R., ed. Ideology in Social Science. London: Fontana, 1972.

Boudon, R. Education, Opportunity, and Social Inequality: Changing Prospects in Western Society. New York: Wiley-Interscience, 1974.

Bourdieu, P. "Kulturelle und Soziale Reproduktion." In Grundlagen einer Theone der symbolischen gewalt, edited by P. Bourdieu and T. C. Passern, pp. 91-137. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp Verlag, 1973.

Bourdieu, P., and Passeron, J. La Reproduction. Paris: Editions de Minuit, 1970.

Buckley, W. Sociology and Modern Systems Theory. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1967.

Bushnell, D. S., and Rappaport, D., eds. Planned Change in Education: A Systems Approach. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1971.

Butts, R. Freeman. "Civilization-Building and the Modernization Process: A Framework for the Reinterpretation of the History of Education." History of Education Quarterly 7 (Summer 1967): 149-74.

Cadwallader, M. L. "The Cybernetic Analysis of Change in Complex Social Organizations." In Modern Systems Research for the Behavioral Scientist: A Sourcebook for the Application of General Systems Theory to the Study of Human Behavior, edited by W. Buckley, pp. 437-40. Chicago: Aldine, 1968.

Callahan. R. Education and the Cult of Efficiency. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.

Carnoy, M. Education and Cultural Imperialism. New York: David McKay, 1974.

Carnoy, M. "Educational Change: Past and Present." In Schooling in a Corporate Society: The Political Economy of Education in America, 2nd. ed., edited by M. Carnoy, pp. 362-374. New York: David McKay, 1975.

Carnoy, M. and Levin, H. M. The Limits of Educational Reform. New York: David McKay, 1976.

Carter, M. Correspondence and Contradiction. Palo Alto, Calif.: Center for Economic Studies, 1975 (mimeographed).

Center for Educational Research and Innovation (CERI). Case Studies of Educational Innovation: IV-Strategies for Innovation in Education, Vol. 1. Paris: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, 1973.

Clignet, R. Liberty and Equality in Education. New York: Wiley-Interscience, 1974.

Cohen, D. K. and Garet, M. S. "Reforming Educational Policy with Applied Research." Harvard Educational Review 45 (February 1975):17-43.

Cohen, Y. A. "Schools and Civilization States." In The Social Sciences and the Comparative Study of Educational Systems, edited by J. F. Fischer, pp. 55-147. Scranton, Pa.: International Textbook Company, 1970.

Collins, R. Conflict Sociology. New York: Academic Press, 1975.

Collins, R. "Functional and Conflict Theories of Educational Stratification." American Sociological Review 36 (December 1971):1002-08.

Coser, L. The Functions of Social Conflict. New York: Free Press, 1956.

Curle, A. Education for Liberation. New York: John Wiley, 1973.

Dahrendorf, R. Bildung ist Buergerrecht. Hamburg: Nannen-Verlag, 1965.

Davis, K. Human Society. New York: MacMillan, 1949.

Davis, K. "The Myth of Functional Analysis as a Special Method in Sociology and Anthropology." American Sociological Review 24 (December 1959): 757-72.

Dreier, P. "Power Structures and Power Struggles." in New Directions in Power Structure Research: The Insurgent Sociologist 5 (Spring 1975): 233-37.

Dunkel, H. B. "Wanted: New Paradigms of a Normative Base for Research." In Philosophical Redirection of Educational Research, edited by L. G. Thomas, pp. 77-93. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972.

Durkheim, E. Education and Sociology. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1956.

Effrat, A. "Power to the Paradigms." In Perspectives in Political Sociology, edited by A. Effrat, pp. 3-33. New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1973.

Elboim-Dror, R. "Some Aspects of the Educational Policy Formation System." In Conflict and Change in Education, edited by F. Ianni, pp. 420-29. Glenview, Ill.: Scott Foresman, 1975.

Emerson, A. E. "Dynamic Homeostasis: A Unifying Principle in Organic, Social, and Ethical Evolution." Scientific Monthly 78 (1954): 67-85.

Forfatterkollerktiv. Skolkreformer i det kapitalistiske samfund. Copenhagen: Rhodos Forlag, 1975.

Fox, H. H. and Schacter, G. "Dynamics of Structural Change." Regional Science and Urban Economics 5 (1975):41-57.

Frank, A. G. "Sociology of Development and Underdevelopment of Sociology." Warner Modular Publications No. 164 (1973).

Freire, P. Education for Critical Consciousness. New York: Seabury Press, 1973.

Freire, P. Pedagogy of the Oppressed. New York: Herder and Herder, 1971.

Galtung, J. "Schooling and Future Society," School Review 83 (August 1975): 533-568.

Galtung, J. "The Dialectics of Education," Convergence 8 (1975):64-76.

Gartner, A. et al. After Deschooling What? Ivan Illich Pro and Con. New York: Social Policy, 1973.

Genovese, E. " Class, Culture, and Historical Process." Dialectical Anthropology (November 1975): 71-80.

Gintis, H. "Towards a Political Economy of Education." Harvard Eductional Review 42 (February 1972): 70-96.

Gintis, H., and Bowles, S. "The Ideology of Educational Reform." Unpublished paper, Department of Economics, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., 1971 (mimeographed).

Goodman, P. Growing Up Absurd, New York: Alfred Knopf, 1960.

Gramsci, Antonio. Gli intelleluali e l'organizzazione della cultura. Turin: Einaudi, 1949.

Gramsci, A. The Modern Prince. London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1957.

Harbison, F. H. "Education: Nationwide Learning Systems." Teachers College Record 76 (May 1975): 539-62.

Heinrich, R. Zur politischen Okonomie der Schuleform. Stuttgart: Europäische Verlagsantalt, 1973.

Hempel, C. G. Aspects of Scientific Explanation. New York: Free Press, 1966.

Horton, J. "Order and Conflict Theories of Social Problems as Competing Ideologies." American Journal of Sociology 71 (May 1966):701-13.

Horton, M. "Decision-Making Process." In Educational Reconstruction: Promise and Challenge, edited by N. Shimahara, pp. 23-42. Columbus: C. E. Merrill, 1973.

House, E. R. "A Critique of Linear Change Models in Education." Educational Technology 11 (1971): 35.

House, E. R. The Politics of Educational Innovation. Berkeley, Calif.: McCutchan, 1974.

House, E. R., et al. "A Test of the Research and Development Model of Change." Educational Administration Quarterly 8 (1972): 1-14.

Huisken, F. Zur Kritik Bürgerlicher Didaktik und Bildungsökonomie. Munich: List Verlag, 1972.

Idenberg, P. J. "Education and Utopia" In Recurrent Education: Concepts and Policies for Lifelong Education, edited by R. Ryba and B. Holms, pp. 6-18. London: The Comparative Education Society of Europe, 1974.

Itzkoff, S. W. Cultural Pluralism and American Education. Scranton, Pa.: International Textbook Company, 1969.

Illich, I. Deschooling Society. New York: Harper and Row, 1971.

Inkeles, A. "The Socialization of Competence." Harvard Educational Review, 36 (Summer 1966): 265-83.

Isard, W. "Notes on an Evolutionary Theoretic Approach to World Organization." Department of Peace Science, University of Pennsylvania, 1975 (mimeographed).

Kallós, D. "Curriculum and Teaching: An Un-American View." Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, April 1975, Washington, D. C.

Karier, C. J., et al. Roots of Crisis. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1973.

Katz, M. B. Class, Bureaucracy, and the Schools: The Illusion of Educational Change in America. New York: Praeger, 1971.

Katz, M. B., ed. School Reform: Past and Present. Boston: Little, Brown, 1971.

Kazamias, A. M. and Schwartz, K. "Sociological Theories and Educational Change." Comparative Education Review 17 (June 1973): 245-54.

Kimball, S. T. "Darwin and the Future of Education." The Educational Forum 25(1960):59-72.

Kimball, S. T. "Education and Developmental Change." In Perspectives in Developmental Change, edited by A. Gallaher, Jr., pp. 71-100. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1968.

King, E. J. "Universities in Evolution." International Review of Education 8 (1966): 399-415.

Klafki, W. "Erziehungswissenschaft als kritischkonstruktive Theorie." Zeitschrift für Pädagogik 17 (1971):351-85.

Kuhn, T. S. The Structure of Scientific Revolution. 2nd. ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971.

LaBelle, T. J. "Cultural Determinants of Educational Alternatives." New Directions for Education No. 4 (Winter 1973):27-46 [Special Issue on "Alternatives in Education"]

Land, K. C. "Theories, Models, and Indicators of Social Change." International Social Science Journal 27 (1975):7-37.

Larkin, R. W. "Pattern Maintenance and Change in Education." Teachers College Record 72 (September 1970):110-19.

Lenski, G. Power and Privilege: A Theory of Social Stratification. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.

Leontief, W. "The Structure of Development." Scientific American, No. 209 (September 1963): 148-167.

Levin, H. M. "Educational Reform and Social Change." The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science 10 (August 1974): 304-19.

Levin, H. M. "Educational Reform: Its Meaning?" Occasional Papers in the Economics and Politics of Education, Stanford University, March 1973.

Levin, H. M. "A Taxonomy of Educational Reforms for Changes in the Nature of Work." Discussion Paper 74-5, Center for Economic Studies, Stanford University, November 1974.

Livingstone, D. W. "Some General Tactics for Creating Alternative Educational Futures," Interchange 4 (1973): 1-9.

Manners, R. E. "Ivan Illich: Schooling and Society." Teachers College Record 76 (May 1975): 639-64.

Marin, P. et al. The Limits of Schooling. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1975.

Masuch, M. Politische Ökonomie der Ausbildung. Hamburg: Rowohlt, 1973,

Messick, S. "Research Methodology and Educational Change." Paper presented at the 1971 Invitational Conference on Testing Problems, October 1971, at New York.

Morgan, R. M., and Chadwick, C. B., eds. Systems Analysis for Educational Change. Tallahassee, Fla.: University of Florida Press, 1971.

Oettinger, A. G. Run, Computer, Run: The Mythology of Educational Innovation. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1969.

Pareek, V., and Rao, T. V. "Planning Self-Renewing Educational Systems." Bulletin of the UNESCO Regional Office for Education in Asia No. 16 (June 1975): 157-70.

Parsons, T. "Evolutionary Universals." American Sociological Review 29 (June 1964):339-57.

Paulston, R. G. "Cultural Revitalization and Educational Change in Cuba." Comparative Education Review 16 (October 1972): 474-85.

Paulston, R. G. "Ethnic Revival and Educational Conflict." Comparative Education Review 20 (June 1976).

Paulston, R. G. "Ethnicity and Educational Change." Comparative Education Review 20 (October 1976).

Paulston, R. G. Folk Schools in Social Change. Pittsburgh: University Center for International Studies, University of Pittsburgh, 1974.

Paulston, R. G. "Socio-Cultural Obstacles to Educational Development." Journal of Developing Areas 5 (April 1971): 401-16.

Paulston, R. G., and LeRoy, G. "Strategies for Non-Formal Education." Teachers College Record 76 (May 1975): 569-97.

Persons, S., ed. Evolutionary Thought in America. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950.

Phillips, C. S. "The Revival of Cultural Evolution in Social Science Theory." The Journal of Developing Areas 5 (April 1971):337-69.

Phillips, D. C., and Kelley, M. E. "Hierarchical Theories of Development in Education and Psychology." Harvard Educational Review 43 (August 1975):351-75.

Pincus, J. "Incentives for Innovation in the Public Schools." Review of Educational Research 44 (Winter 1974):113-43.

Popkewitz, T. "Reform as Political Discourse." School Review 48 (November 1975):43-69.

Pribram, K. Conflicting Patterns of Thought. Washington, D. C.: Public Affairs Press, 1949.

Reimer, E. School's Dead: An Indictment of the System and a Strategy of Revolution. Garden City, N. Y.: Anchor Books, 1970.

Rhodes, R. I. "The Disguised Conservatism in Evolutionary Development Theory." Science and Society 32 (1968): 383-412.

Rubinstein, D. and Simon, B. The Evolution of Comprehensive Schools, 2nd edition. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973.

Rusk, B., ed. Alternatives in Education. OISE Fifth Anniversary Lectures. Toronto: General Publishing Company, 1971.

Russett, C. E. The Concept of Equilibrium in American Social Thought. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1966.

Schermerhorn, R. A. Comparative Ethnic Relations: A Framework for Theory and Research. New York: Random House, 1970.

Schneider, F. "The Immanent Evolution of Education: A Neglected Aspect of Comparative Education." Comparative Education Review 4 (1961):136-39.

Schultz, T. W. "Investment in Human Capital." American Economic Review 51 (1961):1035-38.

Shalaby, I. M., and Chilcott, J. C. The Education of a Black Muslim. Tucson: Impresora Sahuaro, 1972.

Shipman, M. D. Education and Modernisation. London: Faber and Faber, 1971.

Silvert, K., and Risssman, L. Education, Class and Nation. New York: Elsevier, 1976.

Simon, B. Education and the Labour Movement, 1870-1920. London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1965.

Simmons, J. "Education, Poverty, and Development." Working Paper No. 188. Washington, D. C.: The World Bank, 1974.

Simmons, J., et al. "Investment in Education: National Strategy Options for Developing Countries." Working Paper No. 196. Washington, D. C.: The World Bank, February 1975.

Simonds, R. S. "Toward a Paradigm of Educational Change." Ph. D. dissertation, University of Southern California, 1973.

Smelser, N. J. Sociological Theory: A Contemporary View. New York: General Learning Press, 1971.

Smith, A. D. The Concept of Social Change: A Critique of the Functionalist Theory of Social Change. Monographs in Social Theory. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973.

Sorokin, P. "Le concept déquilibre: Est-il necessaire aux sciences sociales?" Revue Internationale de Socologie 44 (1936): 497-529.

Stevens, L. B. "The Paradox of School Reform: Are the Schools Impervious to Redesign?" Phi Delta Kappan 57 (February 1976):371-374.

Stewart, J. H. Theory of Culture Change: The Methodology of Multilinear Evolution. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1955.

Swift, D. W. Ideology and Change in the Public Schools. Columbus: C. E. Merrill, 1971.

Thomas, L. G. Types of Schooling for Developing Nations. Occasional Paper, International and Development Education Program, School of Education, University of Pittsburgh, 1968.

Touraine, A. The Academic System in American Society. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

United States. Agency for International Development. The AID Education Program Strategy. Washington, D. C.: The Agency, 1973.

Vaughan, M., and Archer, M. S. Social Conflict and Educational Change in England and France, 1789-1848. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971.

Wallace, A. F. C. "Revitalization Movements." American Anthropologist 58 (1956):264-81.

Wallace, A. F. C. "Schools in Revolutionary and Conservative Societies." In Cultural Relevance and Educational Issues, edited by F. A. J. Ianni and E. Storey, pp. 230-49. New York: Little, Brown, 1973.

Ward, L. F. "Evolution of Social Structures." American Journal of Sociology 10 (1904-05):589-605.

Watson, G. "Twards a Conceptual Architecture of a Self-Renewing School System." In Change in School Systems, edited by G. Watson, pp. 63-81. Washington, D. C.: National Training Laboratories, 1967:106-115.

Wilson, G., and Wilson, M. The Analysis of Social Change. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965.

Wilson, H. C. "On the Evolution of Education." In Learning and Culture: Proceedings of the 1972 Annual Spring Meeting of the American Ethnological Society, edited by S. T. Kimball and J. H. Burnett, pp. 211-44. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1973.

Wirosuhardjo, K., and Heckelman, T. J. "The Systems Approach to Educational Reform in Indonesia." Bulletin of the UNESCO Regional Office for Education in Asia 6 (September 1971):25-39.

World Bank. Education Sector Working Paper. Washington, D. C.: The World Bank, 1973.

Young, M. F. D., ed. Knowledge and Control. London: Collier-Macmillan, 1971.

Zachariah, M. "They Who Pay the Piper Call the Tune." Paper presented at the Comparative and International Education Society Annual Meeting, March 1975, San Francisco.

Zaltman, G. Processes and Phenomena of Social Change. New York: Wiley-Interscience, 1973.

Zeitlin, I. Ideology and the Development of Sociological Theory. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1968.